

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application.

Claim 1 was objected to because of the minor informalities. Specifically, 'providing information about the paper and the tray to the printing device,' was objected to. This is a correct reading of the specification, see page 4, lines 7-15 in which information about the paper and the tray is provided to 'the system,' which is the printing device, and where 'The printing device then updates...' after the loader has provided it with information. In addition, this claim has been amended to more clearly state that the information about the tray is more specifically 'information about...the tray into which the paper has been loaded.' It is submitted that this amendment overcomes the objection, and withdrawal of this objection is requested.

Claims 1-2, 6, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gibbons et al. (US Patent No. 5,305,020).

As amended, claim 1 requires that the information about the paper provided to the printing device be information about the visual characteristics of the paper. This is discussed on page 4, lines 1-5, of the instant specification, for example. Gibbons discusses the detection of whether thermal paper has a coating on it or not. This is no the same thing as visual characteristics. It is therefore submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 2 and 6 depend from claim 1 and should be ruled allowable for that reason and for their own merits. As discussed above, Gibbons does not teach that the information provided is about the visual characteristics of the printer, nor about which tray a particular paper having a particular visual characteristic is loaded, much less that the device that is provided this information is a printer, as in claim 2. With regard to claim 6, scanning a piece of paper stock is not the same as sensing the presence of a piece of paper. Scanning provides

the information about the visual characteristics of the paper, as discussed in the instant specification at page 4, lines 18-24, as an example. It is therefore submitted that claims 2 and 6 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 12 has been amended to include the same limitation as claim 1. It is submitted that claim 12 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art for the reasons as applied to claim 1, and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claim 14 depends from claim 12 and should be ruled allowable for that reason and for its own merits. Gibbons does not disclose that the medium receiving the information about the visual characteristics of the paper is a printer driver. It is therefore submitted that claim 14 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Parsons et al. (US Patent No. 5,133,048).

As amended, claim 8 requires that the user be provided with a view of the paper, including the visual characteristics of the paper, across a network. Parsons only provides some general information, such as size, type and color, but only to a user standing directly in front of the printer. It is therefore submitted that claim 8 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 9-11 depend from claim 8 and should be ruled allowable for that reason and for their own merits. Parsons does not teach a user interface accessed across a network that allows a user to view paper in at least one tray, where the view includes the visual characteristics of the paper, much less that the paper is a template, as in claim 9, a designated color, as in claim 10, or a thumbnail image of the piece of paper. Parsons allows the user to select from a selection of pre-defined colors, but does not provide a thumbnail image of the paper, just what may be interpreted as a thumbnail example of the paper. It is not an actual

image of the paper. It is therefore submitted that claims 9-11 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 3-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibbons et al. as applied to claim 1 and further in combination with Sanchez et al. (US Patent No. 5,784,177).

Claims 3-5 and 7 depend from claim 1, and should be ruled allowable for that reason and for their own merits. As discussed above, Gibbons provides no teaching about the visual characteristics of the paper and in which tray that paper has been loaded. Sanchez does not cure this deficiency in the combination, being directed to a printer driver that inserts cover sheets, and does not address paper stock, etc. The combination of references does not teach that the visual characteristics are provided to the printing device, much less that the printing device is a copier, as in claim 3, or an MFP as in claim 4. Similarly, the combination of references does not teach that information about the visual characteristics is provided to the printing device through a control input signal from a control interface, as in claim 5, or from a control interface on a computer connected to the printing device, as in claim 7. It is therefore submitted that claims 3-5 and 7 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.


Claim 13 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) unpatentable over Gibbons et al. as applied to claim 12 and in combination with Katahira (US Patent No. 6,628,418). As discussed above, Gibbons does not teach all of the limitations of the base claim 12. Further, Katahira is directed to the control programming of a copier with regard to its overall operation. It is not directed to a code used for the user interface and storing information about the paper in a tray. The code of the instant invention does not affect the control of the device itself, as it does in Katahira, but controls the selection of paper and the user interface.

It is therefore submitted that claim 13 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 222-3613
Customer No. 20575